

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MIDLAND/ODESSA DIVISION**

JUANITA DOE,
Plaintiff

v.

**MIDLAND COUNTY, JUAN
CARLOS SERNA-VENEGAS,
SHERIFF DAVID CRINER, SGT.
PETERS, and MARISELA
MARTINEZ,**
Defendants

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

MO:23-CV-00091-DC

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is the report and recommendation¹ from United States Magistrate Judge Ronald C. Griffin concerning Defendants David Criner and Midland County's Motion to Dismiss Juanita Doe's First Amended Complaint.² Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Rule 1(d) of Appendix C of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Judge Griffin issued his report and recommendation on February 1, 2024. As of the date of this order, no party has filed objections to the report and recommendation.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), a party may serve and file specific, written objections to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation and, in doing so, secure de

¹ ECF No. 20.

² ECF No. 12.

novo review by the district court. When no objections are timely filed, a district court can review the magistrate's report and recommendation for clear error.³

Because no party has filed timely objections, the Court reviews the report and recommendation for clear error. Having done so and finding no clear error, the Court accepts and adopts the report and recommendation as its own order.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge⁴ is **ADOPTED**. Defendants Criner and Midland County's motion to dismiss⁵ is **GRANTED**. Juanita Doe's claims as to Criner and Midland County are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

SIGNED this 20th day of February, 2024.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Counts', with a stylized star-like flourish at the end.

DAVID COUNTS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³ See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note ("When no timely objection is filed, the [district] court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.").

⁴ ECF No. 20.

⁵ ECF No. 12.